## CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD SAN DIEGO REGION

TENTATIVE RESOLUTION NO. R9-2008-0126

ADOPTION OF A NEGATIVE DECLARATION REGARDING
POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS FOR
SKYLINE RANCH COUNTRY CLUB LLC.
RECYCLED WATER PROJECT
SAN DIEGO COUNTY

WHEREAS, the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region (hereinafter Regional Board), finds that:

- 1. In considering the issuance of Waste Discharge Requirements for the treatment of domestic wastewater by Skyline Ranch Country Club LLC. and the use of recycled water for landscape irrigation at the Skyline Ranch Country Club golf course located at 18218 Paradise Mountain Road, Valley Center, California, the Regional Board is required to comply with the provisions of Chapter 3 (commencing with section 21100) of Division 13 of the California Public Resources Code prior to the adoption of any waste discharge requirements; and
- 2. The Regional Board is functioning as the lead agency, which has the principal responsibility for approving the proposed project and is responsible for preparation of environmental documents; and
- 3. The Regional Board prepared an Initial Study for the project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA; Public Resources Code, section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA guidelines (Title 14, California Code of Regulations, section 15000, et seq.); and
- 4. The environmental impacts of this project will be less than significant; and
- 5. The Regional Board has prepared a Negative Declaration pertaining to the proposed discharge of wastes; and
- 6. The proposed Negative Declaration was sent to the State Clearinghouse and local responsible agencies for review; and
- 7. No comments were received; and
- 8. A public notice that the Regional Board proposed to adopt a Negative Declaration was published in the San Diego Union Tribune in compliance with section 15072 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

-2

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT, the Regional Board hereby adopts the Negative Declaration and certifies that the Negative Declaration reflects proper assessment of environmental impacts of the proposed upgrades to the Skyline Ranch wastewater treatment facility and use of recycled water, and that the environmental impacts of the project will be less than significant.

I, John H. Robertus, Executive Officer, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region, on November 12, 2008.

Tentative
JOHN H. ROBERTUS
Executive Officer

#### **Notice of Completion & Environmental Document Transmittal** Mail to: State Clearinghouse, P. O. Box 3044, Sacramento, CA 95812-3044 (916) 445-0613 SCH# For Hand Delivery/Street Address: 1400 Tenth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814 Project Title: Skyline Ranch Recycled Water Project Lead Agency: Ca. Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region Contact Person: Robert Morris Mailing Address: 9174 Sky Park Court Phone: (858) 467-2962 City: San Diego, CA Zip: 92123-4340 County: San Diego Project Location: County:San Diego City/Nearest Community: Valley Center Cross Streets: Paradise Mountain Road & Conchita Road Zip Code: 92082 Lat. / Long.: \_\_ ° ' "N/ ° ' "W Total Acres: Section: 23 Assessor's Parcel No.: 189-08-16 Twp.: T11S Range: R1W Base: SBB&M Within 2 Miles: State Hwy #: none Waterways: Escondido Creek Airports: none Railways: none Schools: Valley Center Middle Document Type: CEQA: ☐ NOP ☐ Draft EIR NEPA: NOI Joint Document Supplement/Subsequent EIR ☐ Early Cons EΑ Final Document ✓ Neg Dec Other (Prior SCH No.) Draft EIS ☐ Mit Neg Dec Local Action Type: ☐ General Plan Update ☐ Specific Plan ☐ General Plan Amendment ☐ Master Plan ☐ General Plan Element ☐ Planned Unit Development Rezone Annexation Prezone ☐ Redevelopment Use Permit Coastal Permit Community Plan Site Plan ☐ Land Division (Subdivision, etc.) ☐ Other Development Type: ✓ Water Facilities: Type Recycled Water MGD 0.045 Residential: Units \_\_ Acres\_ Transportation: Type Mining: Minera Office: Sq.ft. Acres Employees Employees Employees Mineral Industrial: Sq.ft. \_\_\_\_ Acres \_\_\_ Employees \_ \_\_\_ Educational Hazardous Waste: Type Recreational Project Issues Discussed in Document: Recreation/Parks Aesthetic/Visual ☐ Fiscal Vegetation Agricultural Land Flood Plain/Flooding Schools/Universities Water Ouality Air Ouality Forest Land/Fire Hazard Septic Systems Water Supply/Groundwater Archeological/Historical Geologic/Seismic Sewer Capacity Wetland/Riparian Minerals Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading Wildlife ☐ Biological Resources Coastal Zone ☐ Noise Solid Waste Growth Inducing Population/Housing Balance Toxic/Hazardous ☐ Drainage/Absorption Land Use Public Services/Facilities ☐ Traffic/Circulation Cumulative Effects ☐ Economic/Jobs Other Present Land Use/Zoning/General Plan Designation: Project Description: (please use a separate page if necessary)

Skyline Ranch Country Club proposes upgrades to its existing wastewater treatment plant to provide recycled water to its existing on-site golf course. The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region intends to modify the facility's waste discharge requirements to prescribe requirements for the treatment and use of the recycled water consistent with Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations.

Reviewing Agencies Checklist	
Lead Agencies may recommend State Clearinghouse diffyou have already sent your document to the agency p	istribution by marking agencies below with and "X". blease denote that with an "S".
Air Resources Board	Office of Historic Preservation
Boating & Waterways, Department of	Office of Public School Construction
California Highway Patrol	Parks & Recreation
Caltrans District #	Pesticide Regulation, Department of
Caltrans Division of Aeronautics	Public Utilities Commission
Caltrans Planning (Headquarters)	Reclamation Board
Coachella Valley Mountains Conservancy	Regional WQCB #
Coastal Commission	Resources Agency
Colorado River Board	S.F. Bay Conservation & Development Commission
Conservation, Department of	San Gabriel & Lower L.A. Rivers and Mtns Conservancy
<del></del>	San Joaquin River Conservancy
Corrections, Department of Delta Protection Commission	Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
Education, Department of	State Lands Commission
Energy Commission	SWRCB: Clean Water Grants
Fish & Game Region #	SWRCB: Water Quality
Food & Agriculture, Department of	SWRCB: Water Rights
Forestry & Fire Protection	Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
General Services, Department of	Toxic Substances Control, Department of
X Health Services, Department of	Water Resources, Department of
Housing & Community Development	
Integrated Waste Management Board	Other
Native American Heritage Commission	Other
Office of Emergency Services	
Local Public Review Period (to be filled in by lead a Starting Date October 5, 2008	Newsonkow 5, 0000
Lead Agency (Complete if applicable):	
Consulting Firm: Invirotreat Inc.	Applicant: Skyline Ranch Country Club LLC.
Address: 2501 E. Chapman Ave., Suite 100	Address: 18218 Paradise Mountain Road
City/State/Zip: Fullerton, CA 92831	City/State/Zip: Valley Center, CA 92082
Alen I ohol	Phone: 760-749-3233
Contact: Alon Lebel Phone: (714) 745-4692	* *******************************

Authority cited: Section 21083, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 21161, Public Resources Code.

### **Environmental Checklist Form**

1. Project title: Skyline Ranch Recycled Water Project

2. Lead agency name and address: RWQCB, SAN DIEGO REGION

9174 SKY PARK COURT, SUITE 100

SAN DIEGO, CA 92123

3. Contact person and phone number. MR. BOB MORRIS

(858) 467-2962

4. Project location: Skyline Ranch Country Club

18218 Paradise Mountain Rd. Valley Center, CA 92082

5. Project sponsor's name and address:

SKYLINE RANCH COUNTRY CLUB, LLC 18218 PARADISE MOUNTAIN RD. VALLEY CENTER, CA 92082 MR. DOUGLAS SAHM

6. General plan designation: Multiple Rural Use 1 du/ 7. Zoning: RMH3 4,8,20 acres

8. Description of project

Skyline Ranch Country Club (SRCC) is a private mobile park community in Valley Center, California, which has a dedicated wastewater treatment plant (WVVTP), using advanced membrane bioreactor (MBR) system. The WWVTP currently discharges the MBR effluent to a spray field under Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) waste discharge requirements. Effluent from the plant meets the most stringent reuse standards and is suited for tertiary treatment and reclamation under California Department of Public Health Title 22 regulations.

SRCC plans to upgrade the MBR plant to a tertiary treatment plant, by addition of disinfection, and use the treated effluent on its Golf Course as reclaimed irrigation water. The project was already given conditional approval by the California Department of Public Health and the San Diego County Department of Environmental Health.

Upgrading the system for water recycling/reclamation involves, aside from the effluent disinfection stage at the MBR plant, isolation of pipelines designated for effluent water transfer, the transfer of potable water supplied by the Valley Center Municipal Water District to the Golf Course Lake, and the irrigation piping system from the Lake. These modifications will allow for supplementing recycled water from the MBR plant with well water and potable water as needed to meet the irrigation demands of the Golf Course.

9.	9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings								
	SRCC is a golf course community in Valley Center, consisting of 220 residential mobile home units and a 9-hole golf course. The site is located in the rural community of Valley Center, which has isolated homes/ranches.								
10.	0. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)								
	Participating agencies in this project are California Department of Public Health, and San Diego County Department of Environmental Health. Both agencies already issued conditional approval for this project. The approval from both agencies is pending final inspection of the MBR plan and the collection/irrigation piping system to confirm compliance with the standard requirements for water recycling projects.								
			٠.	,					
		•	•						
ENV	'IRONMENTAL FACTORS P	OTE	NTIALLY AFFECTED						
	•				by this project, involving at y the clecklist on the following				
	Aesthetics		Agriculture Resources		Air Quality				
	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Geology /Soils				
	Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Hydrology / Water Quality		Land Use / Planning				
	Mineral Resources		Noise		Population / Housing				
	Public Services	П	Recreation	П	Transportation/Traffic				

Mandatory Findings of Significance

Utilities / Service Systems

## **DETERMINATION**: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation

	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze onlythe effects that remain to be addressed.
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.
	John & Retection 9/17/2008
Sig	gnature Date
	JOHN H. ROBERTUS
	Executive Officer
	California Regional Water Quality Control Board

.

San Diego Region

-3-

#### **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

- A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

#### ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE CHECKLIST

This checklist identifies physical, biological, social and economic factors that might be affected by the proposed project. In many cases, background studies performed in connection with the projects indicate no impacts. A NO IMPACT answer in the last column reflects this determination. Where there is a need for clarifying discussion, the discussion is included in Section VI following the checklist. The words "significant" and "significance" used throughout the following checklist are related to CEQA, not NEPA, impacts.

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
l. a)	AESTHETICS Would the project: Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?					X	
not	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic dings within a state scenic highway?					X	
	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or lity of the site and its surroundings?					X	
	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which adversely affect day or nighttime views in the a?	1				X	
whe env Cali Ass Dep ass	AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining of the impacts to agricultural resources are significant ironmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the fornia Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site essment Model (1997) prepared by the California of Conservation as an optional model to use in essing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would project:					·	
on t	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or mland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown he maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping Monitoring Program of the California Resources ency, to non-agricultural use?					X	
b) Will	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a iamson Act contract?					X	
	Involve other changes in the existing environment ch, due to their location or nature, could result in version of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?					X	
esta con	AIR QUALITY Where available, the significance crit ablished by the applicable air quality management or ai trol district may be relied upon to make the following deuldthe project:	r pollution					
a) app	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the licable air quality plan?					X	
sub	Violate any air quality standard or contribute stantially to an existing or projected air quality ation?					X	
atta air	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-interest under an applicable federal or state ambient quality standard (including releasing emissions which eed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?					X	
d) con	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant centrations?					X	

	Potentially	Significant With	Less Than	N-
	Significant Impact	Mitigation Incorporation	Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?				X ,
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project:				
<ul> <li>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</li> </ul>				X
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				X
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		,		X
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project:				
<ul> <li>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</li> </ul>				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X	
iv) Landslides?				X	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				X	
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				X	
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18- 1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				X	
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X	
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS –					
Would the project:	• .				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X	
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				X	
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X	
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X	
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X	
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X	
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project:					
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				X	
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X	
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				X	
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				X	
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				X	
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X	
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X	
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X	
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X	
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X	
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:	<del></del>	[I			
a) Physically divide an established community?				X	
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				. X	
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X	
X. MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project:					
<ul> <li>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</li> </ul>				X	
CKYLINE DANCH COLINTRY CLUB					

	Potentially´ Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X
XI. NOISE -				
Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				X
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				X
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

Significant Potentially With Less Than Significant Mitigation Significant No Impact Incorporation Impact Impact XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Fire protection? Police protection? Schools? Parks? Other public facilities? XIV. RECREATION a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project: a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? Result in inadequate emergency access? Result in inadequate parking capacity? g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

Less Than

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS –	·	moor portation.	n i parat	mpaot
Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X .
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				<b>X</b> .
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			:	X
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE -				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant				X
or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				X
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X

# This document is considered draft until it is adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region

### DRAFT NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Project Name: SKYLINE RANCH RECYCLED WATER PROJECT

THIS NEGATIVE DECLARATION IS COMPRISED OF THIUS FORM ALONG WITH THE ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY THAT INCLUDES THE INITIAL STUDY FORM

1. CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT NEGATIVE DECLARATION FINDINGS

This Negative Declaration reflects the decision-making body's independent judgment and analysis, and; that the decision-making body has reviewed and considered the information contained in this Negative Declaration and the comments received during the public review period, and; on the basis of the whole record before the decision-making body (including this Negative Declaration) that there are no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment.

2. REQUIRED MITIGATION MEASURES

Refer to the attached Environmental Initial Study for the rationale for requiring the following measures:

None.

3. CRITICAL PROJECT DESIGN ELEMENTS THAT MUST BE CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

The following project design elements were either proposed in the project application or the result of compliance with specific environmental laws and regulations and were essential in reaching the conclusions within the attached Environmental Initial Study.

While the following are not technically mitigation measures, their implementation must be assured to avoid potentially significant environmental effects.

- a. Wastewater will be treated to the levels necessary for the protection of public health and the environment; and
- b. The use of recycled water for landscape irrigation will be required to be conducted in a manner that protects public health in accordance with State Department of Public Health criteria.

ADOPTION STATEMENT: This Negative Declaration was adopted and above California Environmental Quality Act findings made by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region on November 12, 2008.

TENTATIVE
JOHN H. ROBERTUS
Executive Officer
California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region